

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/874,550	06/04/2001	Tony Kroeker	AMAT/2640.C1/ATD/BG	6635	
32588	7590 01/27/2003				
APPLIED M	IED MATERIALS, INC. EXAMINER				
	BLVD. M/S 2061 RA, CA 95050		BRATLIE, S	STEVEN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3652	-	
			DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Applicant(s) Application No.

Office Action Summers	814530	KROEKER
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit E 3652
	BRATH	E 3632
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet be	eneath the correspondence address
Period for Response		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE 3	MONTH(S) FROM THE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reference of the period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by second contents. 	esponse within the statuto expire SIX (6) MONTHS	ry minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered tim from the mailing date of this communication .
Status		
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
☐ This action is FINAL .		
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C		
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s) 46-72		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.	
X Claim(s) 46-72		is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are objected to
□ Claim(s)		
		requirement.
Application Papers		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing R		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	• •	□ disapproved.
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	to by the Examiner.	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		٥
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)		
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unde □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the 		· ·
□ received.		
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)_		·
☐ received in this national stage application from the Interna	itional Bureau (PCT F	ule 1 7.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received:		······································
Attachment(s)		
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s	terview Summary, PTO-413	
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892	otice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-19	
□ Notice of Draftenerson's Patent Drawing Review PTO-048	other	

Office Action Summary

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-97)

Part of Paper No. ___/2__

Application/Control Number: 09/874,550

Art Unit: 3652

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 46-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent #1050802 in view of Kuriki et al, White et al, Edwards et al, and Tanaka. Japanese Patent #1050802 discloses a processing system with a single load lock #52 for each processing chamber #56. Japanese Patent #1050802 lacks a parallel system, a movable lid and lift pins. Kuriki et al (Fig. 8) and White et al disclose load locks in a parallel system. Edwards, et al disclose the use of a movable lid #52, while Tanaka discloses the use of lift pins #38. It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide these features to the primary reference. The motivation is to increase through put.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Bratlie whose telephone number is (703) 308-

Page 3

Art Unit: 3652

2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00. Friday is the examiner's day off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177.

Bratlie/kl January 22, 2003 Steven a Brothe

STEVEN A BRATLIE PRIMARY EXAMINER